UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Education or Ballyhoo?

By Hugh Stevenson Tigner

Can Religion Be Organized?
- - - - - - *Joseph Ernest McAfee*

Gandhi's Economics—II.
- - - - - - *Haridas T. Muzumdar*

Are There Any Christians in Germany?
- - - - - - - *Meta Lilienthal*

Book Reviews
- *Edwin H. Wilson, Franklin K. Gifford*

Trumpets on New Horizons

VOLUME CXII NUMBER 3

Chicago, October 2, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 35
Jottings—J. H. H. 37
ARTICLES—
Soldiers!—*Sir Walter Scott* 35
Education or Ballyhoo?—HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER 38
Can Religion Be Organized?—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 38
Gandhi's Economics—II. HARDIAS T. MUZUMDAR 41
Are There Any Christians in Germany?—META LILIENTHAL 43
POETRY—
Forest Prayer—BRENT ALLINSON 43
Trumpets on New Horizons:
Revolt—HOMER C. HOUSE 44
Machine—A Challenge—MARY WALLACE KIRK 44
Chant at High Mass—ROLAND COOKE 44
New Moon—HARRY ELMORE HURD 44
THE STUDY TABLE—
Two Views of the Editor's New Book:
I. EDWIN H. WILSON 44
II. FRANKLIN KENT GIFFORD 46
CORRESPONDENCE—
Repeal vs. the Recovery Plan—F. S. KINDER 47
Mischievous Sophistry About Battleships—LUCIA AMES MEAD .. 47
THE FIELD—
Twelve Christian Friends of the Jew—*Boston Herald* 34
"Recovery"—*Christian Advocate* 47
Anna Louise Strong in America 48

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Twelve Christian Friends of the Jew

New York, Sept. 17.—Six Americans are listed among the 12 greatest Christian champions of the Jewish people during the last year, according to the result of a nation-wide poll among the editors of 43 Anglo-Jewish newspapers. The result of the vote was made public today by Joseph Brainin, editor of the Seven Arts Feature Syndicate, under whose auspices the poll was conducted.

The 12 outstanding Christians who have most vigorously supported Jewish political and civic rights and who have been the most outstanding in their opposition to anti-Semitism during the Jewish year 5693, according to the 43 editors, were:

Michael Williams, American Catholic layman and editor of *The Commonweal.*

Sir Eric Drummond, former secretary-general of the League of Nations.

Sir Arthur Wauchope, high commissioner of Palestine.

Premier Benito Mussolini of Italy.

Dr. Thomas Masaryk, president of Czechoslovakia.

Camille Chautempts, French minister of the interior.

United States Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas.

The Rev. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

John Haynes Holmes, pastor of the Community Church, New York City.

H. R. Knickerbocker, Berlin correspondent of the New York *Evening Post.*

Sir John Simon, foreign minister of Great Britain.

The Rev. Everett Clinchy, director of the National Conference of Jews and Christians.

The editors gave the following reasons for their American selections:

Michael Williams—For taking the initiative in creating an international emergency committee for the emigration of German Jews and German Christians of Jewish descent and combating Nazi denials

(*Continued on page* 47)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXII MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1933 Number 3

SOLDIERS!

(a) ". . . a tall, raw-boned man, with thick mustaches turned up with a military twist, a broad buff belt, a long rapier, and other outward symbols of the honored profession which lives by killing other people." (Chapter XII.)

(b) "'You are a soldier, then?' she demanded.

'No farther as yet, than as every gentleman of my country is a soldier.'

'Ay, that is your point of honour—to cut the throats of the poor . . .'

'I do not deal in cutting throats, mistress,' replied Nigel; 'but I carry arms to defend myself, and my country if it needs me.'

'Ay,' replied Martha, 'it is fairly worded; but men say you are as prompt as others in petty brawls, where neither your safety nor your country is in hazard' . . .

'Mistress,' returned Nigel, 'I should labour in vain to make you understand that a man's honour, which is, or should be, dearer to him than his life, may often call on and compel us to hazard our own lives, or those of others, in what would otherwise seem trifling contingencies.'

'God's law says naught of that,' said the female; 'I have only read there that Thou Shalt Not Kill.'" (Chapter XXIV.)

Sir Walter Scott, in "The Fortunes of Nigel."

Now that the summer is past, and we have enjoyed our share of vacation rest and refreshment, we feel it a matter of simple duty to pay tribute to the numerous devoted and hardworking men who have stayed at their posts in Washington, day after day through the hottest summer in years, and toiled to save this nation from disaster. Whether these government officials have wrought wisely or unwisely is a matter of spiritually little moment as compared with the sacrifices which they have made for the common good. The President has nobly set example to his associates and subordinates, and by his unfailing cheerfulness and patience and untiring zeal given the nation a leadership which, successful or unsuccessful in its results, will still stand in itself as one of the finest personal achievements of our time. Second to Mr. Roosevelt stands Secretary Ickes. No one man, with one exception, has carried a bigger burden or faced a huger responsibility than he. His chief virtue, perhaps, is that he has worked in silence, seeking no credit and asking no publicity. General Johnson must come next, if only because of the Herculean nature of his task. Unfortunately he has talked much too much, and in all too dictatorial a spirit. His military training and temperament have been too much for him! But this man can be forgiven almost any thing, we feel, in the light of his wellnigh unheard of labors to create, start, and operate the great machine of NRA. To these leaders should be added the names of scores, of hundreds, of other officials, many of whom have toiled as hard, and much more obscurely, at their trying jobs. And the newspaper correspondents, too, who have uncomplainingly and without rest put in the fiercest summer in their careers! The story of Washington in the hot months of 1933 is one of the hero sagas of our day. As we think of it, we feel ashamed of criticisms which we have made and of complaints which we have offered. If the administration has made mistakes, it is because it has tried to do something; and if in the end it fails, it will not be for lack of trying. We still have our own ideas and principles, but we would be second to none in paying homage to faithful public servants.

When President Roosevelt organized his Reforestation Camps we called the idea a farce—a mere playing with the unemployment problem to the end of deceiving the people that something was being done. During the summer the President visited some of the camps with an immense retinue of reporters and photographers, and the public was duly informed that here in these camps was the perfect solution of our problems. But the deception could not be indefinitely kept up. From the start it was evident to those in touch with the camps that the scheme as a part of the general recovery program was the silliest thing ever. Then slowly but surely it became apparent that the farce had its tragic aspects—that the conservation camps, so far from being centers of busy work and manly discipline, were as a matter of fact centers of idleness, dissipation, and general demoralization. Thus, in the *Christian Century* of August 30th last, a Union Theological Seminary student writes a letter telling of his observation of "five camps within a radius of ten miles" of his home at Luray, Virginia. The letter, moderate in tone, serious in temper, and convincingly circumstantial, states that "the boys . . . have been guilty of every conceivable depredation, . . . and according to one reputable citizen 'have raised hell generally.'" Most of these boys "worked three hours a day, some not three hours a week, and some not at all." They roamed city and country as they pleased, to "loaf, shoot pool, replenish the bootleggers, and fre-

quent the homes of women of questionable character." In September, from quite another part of the country, in New Hampshire, came the vigorous protests and complaints of outraged inhabitants. Thus, the selectmen of Tamworth declared that "the boys are apparently under no discipline or supervision whatever. They come to town and howl all night. They annoy women and actually break into houses." The Union Theological student, above quoted, states that "when the truth is finally known, the placing of the civilian conservation camps in the hands of the War Department will be revealed as an outstanding deception of the American people." The trouble is deeper than that! Careless as the War Department has been, it is the camp idea itself that is the "deception." Heaven grant that the rest of the President's program is not the "fake" this is!

General Johnson's exemption of the churches from the operation of National Recovery Act is a surprise. We wonder why this privilege should be granted, or whether it *is* a privilege to be excused from what Washington is describing as a patriotic service which everybody owes to the salvation of the country. Has the General suddenly remembered that there is such a thing as the separation of church and state in this republic? Does he agree with the *Christian Century's* suggestion that it would be incredible for "General Johnson (to) hand down to the churches a made-in-Washington code, as he did to the oil industry, and say, "Sign here"? If so, a new era has come since the War, when the churches, not unwillingly, were conscripted into the war service of the nation, and told, as a top-sergeant tells his "rookies," what to do and what not to do. More likely is it that the General is seeking the favor of the churches. For one thing is amazingly conspicuous these days, and that is that the churches are keeping their heads. In the fierce and rather farcical campaign of bally-hoo which has been sweeping America in recent weeks, the churches have simply refused to succumb to the hysteria which engulfed them in 1917-1918. One dose of that madness was evidently enough, at least for this generation! The most sane, discriminating and independent editorial comments which we have seen on the NRA, have been in the religious journals. The most temperate, intelligent, and also independent discussion of this same subject which we have anywhere encountered, has been in the pulpits of the land. While everybody else has been stampeded, the churches have held their ground, and thus preserved their dignity and self-respect as guardians of the moral and spiritual ideals of the people. This is not to say that the churches have opposed the NRA. On the contrary, they have supported it as a long step in the direction of those industrial principles which they have themselves long since formulated in their own codes, or "social platforms." But they have done this in their own way and for their own reasons. No wonder the General is seeking to buy favors!

Albert Einstein's recantation of pacifism, if correctly reported, is a terrible blow. We would not pass judgment, least of all condemnation, on the great scientist, for we think it poor business for any one who is in safety and happiness to criticize another who lies in deadly peril. Let it be remembered that Einstein has been caught in the awful Hitler persecution of the German Jews, and is one of its deadly as he is certainly its most distinguished victim. The Nazis have seized his home and property, and thus driven him naked from his native land. They have reviled and denounced him; and now, according to late reports, have put a price upon his head, and thus turned against him that conspiracy of assassination which has been so successful in other cases. We know that Einstein mourns not so much for himself as for his stricken compatriots; but his own predicament is pitiable, and renders him indeed immune from censure. But if we would not criticize the man, we would at least place on record our sense of devastation and desolation at his repudiation of pacifism under the impact of the Nazi terror. According to dispatches, Einstein in a published letter has advised two Belgian conscientious objectors to abandon their nonresistant pacifism. The Hitler triumph, he says, has altered the case, and therewith apparently the principle. Belgium needs "preparedness" in order to "insure its existence," and it is the duty of Belgian citizens to accept military service as their contribution "to the salvation of European civilization." The coincidence of Belgium, in this episode, is ironical. For of course Einstein's counsel in this instance applies perfectly to Belgium in 1914 in the face of the German invasion. The plea for pacifism, in other words, sprung from the horror and iniquity of the World War, is now abandoned by one of its most famous and beloved advocates. We do not blame, but we mourn in an almost heartbreaking agony. For this seems to us, in the light of idealism at least, to be Hitler's greatest victory over his foes.

The death of Viscount Grey, Foreign Secretary in Asquith's cabinet at the outbreak of the World War, marked the passing of the most tragic political figure of our age. The tragic aspects of Grey's career had their root in the inherently high and noble quality of the man himself. Had this man been a typical diplomat, of the Berchtold character, for example, one would think of his wickedness, not of his tragedy. But there was no wickedness in Grey, either in his personality or in his practice of his profession. His

sins were ignorance, weakness, and the duplicity into which even an essentially honest and high-minded man is tempted through fear and shame. Thus, nobody can deny, or even question, Sir Edward Grey's abhorrence of war and passion for peace. His statesmanship, through twenty years, was a peace statesmanship. But, alas, he was by training and at heart a British imperialist, and his diplomacy was therefore (honestly) an imperialistic diplomacy. Hence his policy in joining secretly an alliance, or *entente,* with France and Russia which led not only Britain but Europe as well straight into the horrors of 1914. The most peaceful foreign secretary of the day was one of the prime makers of the World War! When Grey saw this, in those agonizing days of July-August, 1914, he suffered horrors of mind which confused him, misled him, betrayed him. How magnificent it would have been had he stood up in that awful crisis, confessed his fault, and sought to save England and the world before it was all too late! But, no! Seeking desperately for something, *anything,* to justify his policy, to save himself as a man and statesman, he seized upon the Belgian episode as a garment to hide, and even glorify, his shame. Pledged to his allies, without knowledge of his countrymen, to take the Empire into the war, he presented Belgium as the real and decisive reason. Here was moral following upon political collapse. It was tragedy worthy of Greek drama. To the end of time the condemnation of history will rest upon this man, but it will be a condemnation of pity, not of blame.

The death of CHARLES H. PARKHURST on September 8th last, in his ninety-first year, revived the memory of one of the greatest Christian ministries in the history of New York City. No list of the distinguished clergymen who have stood in the pulpits of the nation's metropolis during the last one hundred years would be accurate which did not have Parkhurst's name listed among the first two or three. He was a noble scholar, a devoted pastor; an able preacher; but primarily he was great, and in his career rendered himself immortal, after the fashion of Amos and Isaiah, as a prophet and servant of righteousness. New York has a short memory, but it will never forget the February Sunday forty-one years ago when the minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, a New England-reared and Puritan-trained man, arose in his pulpit and poured out his blistering philippic against Tammany Hall and its alliance through the police with vice and crime. What followed after constitutes one of the most thrilling chapters in the history of the city. Challenged by the Tammany district-attorney to prove his charges, this dauntless Christian went out personally into the haunts of iniquity—into the saloons and dance-halls, the gambling-dens and houses of prostitution—and gathered his evidence. When he had it, he fired it in a volley which shook the nation. There followed the famous Lexow investigation; and when the battle was over; Richard Croker was a fugitive in Ireland, Tammany was driven from the seats of power, and Mayor Strong was leading the first reform administration. It was a tremendous victory, for which Parkhurst paid a tremendous price. For years he was ridiculed, insulted, and threatened. He became the butt of ribald songs and jests. Everywhere his name was laughed at or denounced. Even his parishioners questioned the wisdom of his activities, and his brethren of the cloth lamented his "sensationalism." But it was only the timid or the wicked who pilloried him. Those who understood knew the courage of the man, and his single-minded devotion to a religion which kept clean the ways of common life. First among all the clergymen of his day, Charles H. Parkhurst vindicated the function and power of his profession. He was hero, prophet, martyr, saint. What a pity he could not have lived to see the final defeat which promises to overwhelm the "new Tammany" this fall!

Jottings

UNITY has no NRA symbol at its mast-head, because it does not have enough paid employees in its office to qualify. UNITY is doing its part in keeping down expenses. Now if our subscribers and friends will do their part in keeping up income, we shall be able, like the nation, to enjoy "recovery."

The people of Seattle, given a chance to express themselves, have killed and buried Daylight Saving. Wouldn't the people everywhere do the same, if they had this same chance? As if there were not trouble enough in the world without adding this ridiculous and unnecessary confusion!

When history comes to be written, it will probably be set down as the crowning instance of the fatuousness of our age that a world's fair held in the year 1933 was called "A Century of Progress."

What's in a name? Not much—at least in politics! Thus, Hitler is a Socialist; the late President Machado, of Cuba, was a Liberal; and Raskob, McAdoo, and other millionaires are Democrats.

"A movement to revive the art of spinning here was begun yesterday."—New York *Times* (August 16, 1933).

Gandhi comes to America!

Shakespeare says there is "good in everything." There is! The Fascist salute is magnificent.

J. H. H.

Education or Ballyhoo?

Every now and then it is reported from NRA headquarters that an "educational campaign" is about to be launched; whereupon some official sallies forth and delivers a speech at some strategic point or dramatic moment. Sometimes it is the President himself who enlightens us; sometimes it is General Johnson; again it is one of the General's aides; today it is National Commander Louis Johnson of the American Legion.

That we need to be educated no one will deny. Sociologists have long been saying that our ideas are deplorably behind the times—"social lag" is the term they use. Americans are not much given to reflection, and most of us find ourselves utterly bewildered by the events of the past four years. We understand little of the nature of our predicament and have few ideas as to how we are going to get out of it. We need light. Furthermore, the National Industrial Recovery Act came upon us very suddenly, and a great many of us have not yet grasped the philosophy of its principles and do not know clearly where that novel piece of legislation is trying to direct us. In short, we both need and welcome education.

But just how educational are these official "educational" efforts? Mr. Roosevelt's latest lecture, delivered to the inhabitants of Dutchess County (N. Y.), informed us that the efforts of his administration were being devoted to extending the good old principle of neighborliness. Several days later, General Johnson tells the Boston Chamber of Commerce that the simple purpose behind the NRA is to help every man "practice his rugged individualism, but to practice it above the belt." On the day that I write, Commander Johnson of the American Legion informs us that we are fighting our way through another Argonne, that we have three days in which we can save America, and that "Here is something for every red-blooded American to fight for"—"no time for slackers or conscientious objectors."

Obviously, it is a travesty to call this education. It is unadulterated ballyhoo, a patter of cross-roads sentimentality, emotional catch-phrases and an appeal to Kaiser-hanging psychology. And it is thoroughly lamentable. The times are too portentous, our situation is altogether too crucial, for flag-wavers and rah-rah squads to be adequate. We need to be pricked into fundamental thinking. We need to be driven to analyze our situation. We need to be stimulated toward a philosophy of social regeneration. We need to develop an ideology pertinent to the realities of economics, politics, sociology and history. We need someone to give us a dramatic vision of goals and values in civilization. These ballyhoo campaigns are powerful influences toward keeping the American people politically and socially immature. They fertilize the fuzz on our brains.

HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER.

Can Religion Be Organized?

There are two distinct bodies of data which we commonly blanket under the term religion. One group of beliefs are purely personal; they gain social significance only as they are reflected in the conduct of the individual. The others are of immediate social significance; they are shared convictions upon which social programs are built. We apply the term religion with little discrimination now to one group and now to the other, and at other times to both.

As intelligence spreads, and individuals develop the capacity and practice of independent thinking, the former group of beliefs increase in number and importance. At the same time the individual grows less forward in sharing them. He becomes more tolerant. He asks the right to cherish his own views, and freely accords the right to others. Citizens of diverse and irreconcilable beliefs which fall into the first group freely mingle in the same community on the best of terms, and collaborate in social enterprises which draw upon the second group of doctrines for their inspiration. There is a tendency in many communities to apply the name religion exclusively to beliefs of the first group, that is, to purely personal opinions; it is insisted that "religion" shall not factor in the conduct of enterprises upon which the community unites.

Religion, when confined to these private opinions, is not now considered a proper topic of controversy, scarcely of conversation; religious disputes are evidences of lack of culture. An Englishman, when asked what religion he professed, replied, "Gentlemen have but one religion." When urged to say what that religion is, he countered, "No gentleman will tell." This attitude is inevitable in a cultured society, if personal and purely private views are what is really meant by religion; only a boor will flaunt his opinions before those known contentedly to differ.

As already remarked, this body of data tends to increase. Beliefs once forming the very fabric of the social order become matters of private concern. What is still often styled the central belief of religion would seem to be in this process. A belief in the tribal or national God was once the *sine qua non* of membership in the social group defined. That was the way to determine to what race or nation an individual belonged: who or what is his God? Differences in this belief ran into the vitals of the social structure. They were the inspiration of bloody wars and irreconcilable inter-tribal and international clashes. Now, however, and among us, it is difficult to work up a spirited debate upon the existence and nature of God. One believes in God or one does not; the majority of intelligent Americans turn away from discussion of the doctrine in a sense of futility.

The "debate" recently conducted in the *Christian Century* by three outstanding scholars and leaders of American thought proved intensely interesting to some of us. We followed each turn of the argument with sustained and critical attention. But those of us so minded soon found ourselves surprisingly isolated. Of the many readers of the *Christian Century* with whom I talked during the running of the articles, I found very few whose interest persisted. The common reply

to my inquiry was that the reader had long ago exhausted his patience, and the articles were systematically omitted in his reading. Correspondence published by the editors showed that this attitude was not uncommon elsewhere. Neither theists nor non-theists were greatly concerned; they did not particularly care whether their positions were ably sustained by their protagonists or not.

What is true of this belief, which was once the central doctrine of socialized religion, is true also of others once holding a scarcely less determinative place in the social scheme. The immortality of the soul, salvation from sin by vicarious atonement: one finds satisfaction in these doctrines or one does not. The individual who is interested reads literature designed to interpret and render them the more satisfying; few or none read to have them proved or disproved. If one is not interested one does not read at all on those subjects; attempts to make them the materials of missionary zeal are generally resented, at least among the intelligent and in this country. I have a fundamentalist friend who was once a vehement and intollerant propagandist of his particular views. He has not ceased to be a fundamentalist, but he has made up his mind that religious cantankerousness is futile. He gains satisfaction from his own religious beliefs and now cheerfully accords his neighbors the privilege he claims for himself. He is a mark of a tendency which now prevails quite generally.

This reticence is commendable, if by religion we mean that body of beliefs, doctrines, data of experience which are sacred to each individual. In that case, attempts at socialization, that is, organization, are an impudence, certainly an imprudence. On the other hand, if we mean by religion that great and increasing body of convictions necessary to the construction of a stable and efficient social order, then we should all be discussing religion, and gaining the intelligence to make what we think and say worth while. In that case, the hope of religion, as of the society which it would serve, is its socialization, its organization.

I think we can find tests by which these two groups may be differentiated, even though it be true that certain doctrines or beliefs are passing back and forth from one group to the other. Is the particular belief capable of scientific verification? Is there tangible evidence to substantiate it? Will two rational beings, starting from different viewpoints, by processes of reasoning naturally and inevitably come together on it? Beliefs not rationally verifiable, that is, beliefs which can be entertained or not by intelligent individuals, belong in the former group. Beliefs on which a common social life must be built fall into the latter. Intelligent people are now in hopeless disagreement about the existence and nature of God. The doctrine of God thus does not now admit of social programming. On the other hand, the care of the dependent by the community is a doctrine which now claims the assent of majorities in all American communities. It is of such a nature that assent compels concrete action. On this doctrine, therefore, our communities have organized social programs.

Beliefs in the second group are often and initially quite as far from commanding universal assent as are those in the first. They often lead to sharp controversy. But they have this character which doctrines of the former group lack: discussion of them comes to something. The problems they raise are solvable. Practical programs grow out of their agitation. They are, after so long a time, found to be sound and true, beyond continued difference of opinion among the majority of intelligent citizens, or else they are found to be unsound and impractical, and are dropped by the intelligent majority.

Now, it has transpired—through what causes and circumstances we need not here detail—that our current religious organization is concerned mainly if not wholly with beliefs of the former group, that is, with those which do not actually lend themselves to organization in an intelligent community. And, on the other hand, official religion is concerned only sketchily if at all with the doctrines which can be incorporated in social programs, and for the lack of which the community today languishes. This anomaly is not generally apprehended, and few realize how fundamental, therefore, is what actually ails our churches. We are zealously seeking to do the impossible in organized religion, and are leaving undone religious ministries on which the vital interests of the community depend.

The year-by-year and day-by-day consequences of this misdirected effort on the part of official religion lie so plainly before any citizen who will observe, that their very familiarity constitutes their snare. Churches are organized about bodies of doctrine and experience which cannot be successfully incorporated in a social program; their creeds have become so meaningless, and agreement upon them is so hopeless, that for most practical purposes those creeds are today in the discard. Yet they are still so wrought into the structure of the churches that they can be made the instruments of disruption and frustration of practical social programs whenever even a small element in the membership is so minded.

The disastrous effects of the neglect by official religion of the second group of beliefs are even more serious than is the misuse of the beliefs in the first group. Numberless reforms and vital social movements wait upon the driving power of the human religious impulses. Yet this power commonly cannot be brought to bear; official religion bars the way. Practical projects can often be even attempted only after it has been agreed among the citizens that "religion" shall not be permitted to mix in. Yet these projects are themselves essentially religious and should have back of them the energy which is alone to be had from the reservoirs of the citizens' religious natures. If any reader wishes to test this only let him detail the number of things which require the conscience and essential religious devotion of members of his own community, and which now go lame or are completely neglected because it is impossible to induce the churches either to act or to get out of the way and release for needful community service the religious energies pent up in them.

These disastrous day-by-day effects are accentuated in critical times. Two of these crises are live issues in the experience of the present generation. The psychology of the war and of the immediate post-war period aroused to great vigor that element in the churches who soon came to call themselves fundamentalists. They take the creeds of the churches seriously. In almost every one of the major denominations they carried on militantly in the demand that only those loyal to the churches' creeds should be permitted

to be in control. On the face of their demands they were right. Any unprejudiced arbiter would say that organizations founded upon and molded about definite statements of doctrine should be in control of agents loyal to those doctrines. As a matter of fact, the machinery of most denominations was to a large extent in command of those who in their own interpretations had trimmed, and emasculated and otherwise modified those doctrines without official sanction. The controversy seriously threatened the split of several of the leading denominations, and repercussions have not yet subsided by any means. But the "modifiers," the modernists, have generally won, so far as command of the official machinery and offices of the churches are concerned. So deeply aggrieved have the fundamentalists felt themselves that they have in some instances started movements or institutions inside or outside of the denominations by way of preserving the sanctity of creedal contracts. This occurred notably at Princeton, where the fundamentalist group of the faculty felt it necessary to withdraw after official defeat, and erect a new theological seminary loyal to "pure" doctrine.

The result of this controversy has been a pronounced weakening of the churches. The fundamentalists were right and they have been defeated. The modernists won through palpable evasions, and not without discreditable compromises. Church officials continue to subscribe to creeds which they do not believe. Ministers in countless pulpits dare not speak their full mind and heart on vital matters of doctrine. Such a sapping of moral stamina is fatal, especially in institutions devoted to religion, where sincerity is of determinative concern.

The fundamentalists are right in the letter: creeds ought to mean what they say. But they are wrong, fatally wrong in seeking to build social institutions upon the kind of beliefs which are commonly embodied in church creeds. Their assault upon a common enemy has given the fundamentalists an artificial coherence. In situations where they win they speedily fall into petty, competing factions, incapable of effective social action. This is natural and inevitable, considering the nature of the ties by which they attempt to hold together. There can be no institutional agreement among even measurably intelligent people upon the doctrines which they so dramatically defend.

The other crisis of our generation is now immediately upon the churches and their missionary program. The so-called Laymen's Report, presenting the findings and recommendations of a group of eminent lay churchmen, after a review of the missionary activities of the American churches abroad, has aroused storms of protest from mission board executives, and from prominent leaders in various denominations. For the purposes of our discussion, it will suffice to point out that this document urges concentration of missionary activity upon our second group of beliefs, the only ones, indeed, which are capable of effective social action. It deplores the emphasis which missionaries have so generally laid upon the beliefs of our first group, through which they have confused and misled many of the simpler-minded in foreign parts, and have alienated more intelligent "natives" on mission fields.

The reaction to this Report from official religion is disconcerting. It seems clear that the churches and their missionary leaders are not going squarely to face the issue which this document raises. They are in large part vehement in their resistance. They seem determined to continue the futility of propagating institutionally bodies of beliefs on which there can be no intelligent agreement, and whose institutional propagation inspires insincerity and spiritual blight as certainly as the human is what it is.

It is not to be inferred from what has been said that the beliefs in our first group are false or worthless. As a matter of fact, the individual citizen, each in his own terms and for his own purposes, may find them of great value. It makes a difference how each citizen "thinketh in his heart." But it is important above all else that his thinking should be his own and sincere. Doubtless there is a legitimate and desirable social approach to these beliefs through education, but it is altogether necessary to the effective social use of these beliefs that the education through which they are cultivated shall be free from taint of dogmatism. Beliefs of this first group which are not genuinely and indefeasibly one's own are worse than no beliefs at all; better that the mind shall be blank at the point of their impact.

Official religion is today incompetent on both counts. It has not insights nor the social equipment required for the wholesome treatment of beliefs in our first group. Its education is not free from taint of dogmatism. Its methods are as a rule impossible when appraised as education. Its institutional misdirections and maladjustments are destroying rather than conserving the legitimate effects of religious thinking and religious training. On the other count, official religion is impotent in the great social crisis of the present moment, and is for the most part oblivious of the spiritual issues involved. Multitudes are calling for bread, and the most vociferous message of our churches is that man shall not live by bread alone! Current discussion in church circles, pronouncements from countless pulpits, deliverances from official assemblies of the churches, show that what is most on the mind of our religious leadership is that the present economic debacle shall redound to the magnifying of the church's "spiritual" mission and message. Indeed, some elation is shown in the material sufferings of the multitude, in the confidence that their stark deprivation of what the churches have not got will drive these multitudes to resort to the churches for that "spiritual" sustenance which the churches are supposed to have. The stake of religion in the enormously significant economic and social issues of the depression has dawned upon the consciousness of few of our official religious leaders. Great reservoirs of religious energy are thus shut away from the community in this day of its greatest need for just those insights and that human forcefulness which religion alone can supply.

Can religion be organized? Yes; organizable religion can be organized. And, by the same token it must appear that unorganizable religion cannot be effectively organized. The correction of our double blunder is not far to seek: quit cooping up in creed-bound churches what should be free to every citizen in the sanctuaries of his own soul, and harness our enormous regenerative social resources to the practical ministries for the lack of which our communities now languish.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Gandhi's Economics

II

Gandhi is not a Socialist in the ordinary sense of the term. Indeed, his conceptions of Socialism are somewhat distorted. In a speech in 1916, he said, "I am no Socialist, and I do not want to dispossess those who have possessions." The central thesis of Socialism seems to have escaped him entirely. Be that as it may, to judge from the recent resolution of the All-India National Congress, in the framing of which he had a hand, we may say that Gandhi believes in a graduated income tax and in an almost confiscatory tax upon inheritance of wealth beyond a certain minimum amount.

These two proposals I understand are also to be found in the magician's bag of Senator Huey P. Long. There can be no question of bad ethics in the proposed high taxes on income and inheritance, because these large incomes and accumulations of wealth were in the first instance facilitated by society. Society provided the opportunities for the amassing of this wealth, and it is entitled to take the wealth back in the interests of the large majority. If I mistake not, the single taxers also base their claim upon the same principle.

With reference to international dealings, Gandhi, has this to say, addressing a public meeting in London: "Let me assure you that you cannot honestly balance the budget without first balancing the relations between India and England." Translated into general terms, this means no country can honestly balance its budget without first balancing its relations with other countries.

In our economic relations with England, the problem of the so-called public debt of India looms large in Gandhi's thinking. If you knew the history of the public debt of India, you would agree with Gandhi and the Indian nationalists in their contention that the least that could be done is to have this whole problem of the supposed obligations of India to England examined by an impartial international committee of experts. During these days, when you are discussing the problem of cancelling, or scaling down, the debts of the Allies to the United States, it is well to keep in mind that the so-called public debt of India (the major part of which was raised in the London money market) really constitutes not the investment of British capital in India for the development of Indian resources, but an investment of British capital for the maintenance of British power in India and for the upholding of the British empire throughout the world.

Our public debt roughly amounts to three and a half billion dollars, and the drain of wealth from India to the British shores, it has been computed by competent economists, has been over thirty-five billion dollars.

Whatever may be said of Gandhi's economic theories, I may assure you, that no arrangements will be acceptable to Gandhi and the Congress which do not guarantee India's right to submit to impartial scrutiny the burden of the so-called public debt of India.

Gandhi is opposed to the institution of the dole system. He believes in giving work to the unemployed and paying them for it.

He believes in legislation designed to relieve the needs of those who may be hard pressed by the present economic order. To use his own phrase, so far as possible he would like to equalize conditions for all citizens of India, if need be by social legislation. To quote Gandhi:

> I am afraid that for years to come India would be engaged in passing legislation in order to raise the down-trodden, the fallen, from the mire into which they have been sunk by the capitalists, by the landlords, by the so-called higher classes, and then, subsequently and scientifically, by the British rulers. If we are to lift these people from the mire, then it would be the duty of the national government of India, in order to set its house in order, continually to give preference to these people and even free them from the burdens under which they are being crushed.
>
> If the landlords, zemindars, monied men, and those who are today enjoying privileges—I do not care whether they are Europeans or Indians—found that they were discriminated against, I should sympathize with them, but I would not be able to help them, even if I could possibly do so, because I should seek their assistance in that process. Indeed, without their assistance, it would not be possible to raise these people out of the mire.
>
> Look at the condition, if you will, of the untouchables, if the law goes to their assistance and sets apart miles of territory. At the present moment, they hold no land; at the present moment they are absolutely living at the mercy of the state. They can be removed from one quarter to another without complaint and without being able to seek the assistance of the law. Well, the first act of the Legislature will then be to see that, in order somewhat to equalize conditions, these people are given (land) grants free.
>
> From whose pockets are these grants to come? Not from the pockets of Heaven. Heaven is not going to drop money for the sake of the State. They will naturally come from the monied classes.[1]

Gandhi also believes in fixing minimum salaries for government positions. It is his conception that the government position is a public trust and not a money-making source. Certainly there can be no place for graft through political machinery in his scheme of things. The present administrative machinery of India is the costliest in the world.

The Governor-General of India receives over three times the salary of the President of the United States of America, and, whereas, there is no great discrepancy in the salaries paid to the highest officials and their subordinates in the government of the United States of America, in India the discrepancy is vast between the salaries of the highest officials who are usually British and the subordinate officials who are usually Indians.

To quote but one instance, in New York City the Chief of Police receives $3,500.00 a year, Captains $2,750, Lieutenants $2,250.00, Sergeants $1,750.00 and Patrolmen $1,400.00. In India the Inspector Generals (always British) receive from $8,000.00 to $12,000.00, Deputy Inspector Generals (always British) from $6,000.00 to $7,200.00, District Superintendents of Police (British) from $2,666.00 to $4,800.00, Assistants (Eurasian) from $1,200.00 to $2,000.00, Inspectors (Eurasian or Indian) from $600.00 to $1,000.00, Sub-Inspectors (Indian) from $200.00 to $400.00, Head Constables (Indian) from $60.00 to $80.00, Constables (Indian) from $40.00 to $48.00 per year.

Gandhi would reorganize this whole administrative machinery, lop off the salaries at the top and increase the salaries at the bottom, thereby equalizing conditions to some extent.

I am reminded of the story of an Englishman and

1. *Gandhi Versus the Empire*, by the present writer, pp. 262 ff. New York: Universal Publishing Co., 1933.

an Indian. The Englishman once spoke to his Indian friend and said: "You people are anxious to go into government service for the money it brings you. We go in for the honor that is attached to it." To which the Indian replied: "We all strive to get the things we do not have. The Indian is short of money and the Englishman, well, perhaps short of honor."

Gandhi would want to lighten the burden of taxation, especially upon the peasantry, and thereby promote prosperity.

Gandhi would want to abolish the salt monopoly of the British Government, and make it easy for the village folk dwelling along the seashore to pick up salt made by nature, or to manufacture salt on a small scale in their homes at no cost whatsoever.

I should like to have you consider for a moment the implications of the spinning wheel. Gandhi may or may not have in mind the far reaching effects of his revolutionary technique. The spinning wheel is a tool of production. We are telling the people that this tool of production, the spinning wheel, is their property, belongs to them and to nobody else. In other words, the idea of the ownership of the tool of production by the producers, by the workers, is becoming part of Indian ideology at this moment. It simply means that when we want to put together a dozen spinning wheels and have a dozen men operate them, the idea of corporate ownership of these tools of production will have been there already. The perception of the next step is easy, namely, that the tools of production, large scale or small scale, belong to the workers, and it may be noted that one of the fundamental theses of the Congress and Gandhi is that the key industries shall be run by the State. The slow moving wheel, in other words, I daresay, will mean the beginning of a most important social and economic revolution in India.

What Russia is attempting to do by violence and by dictatorship Gandhi will have achieved by the slow process of permeation.

The problem of land nationalization is very simple for India, because theoretically the government is the big landlord, and all the cultivators are the tenants. In those territories where a permanent land revenue settlement was fixed by the British government, we will have to introduce rather drastic changes. With these economic changes designed to equalize conditions, the money lender who is the bane of the Indian scene will have disappeared, and a true foundation would have been laid for prosperity and contentment.

In conclusion, I should like to contrast the American scene of today with the Indian scene, as transformed by Gandhi's economics. A very apt description of the American scene has been given by James Truslow Adams in one of his recent books. To quote Mr. Adams:

> There is no rest from the effort to make money in ever larger and larger amounts. There is no prospect of comfortable retirement in old age. For many who never thought of it in the old days, there is the ever present specter of illness and incapacity. Our prosperity can be maintained by making people want more, and work more, all the time. Those, and they are many, who believe that our recent prosperity has been mainly caused by the phenomenal expansion of the automobile business, tell us that it will soon be necessary to find some other article which will similarly take the public fancy, and create billions in sales and billions of expense to men already tired of doing nothing but meeting new expenses.

The conclusion is inescapable. You satisfy one want and create two more. You are not happy when you are without some sort of a want—rather a contradiction psychologically. Your whole economic structure is based upon the principle of competition.

The main goal of economic society in the Western world seems to be to produce more and more goods, to use high pressure salesmanship, to force those goods on unwilling customers, to institute an installment plan, and to get "busted."

Wealth in its original sense meant the weal—the well-being—of the people. We have lost sight of this true meaning of wealth which economic organization is expected to foster. We have been chasing material things without ever having the time to enjoy them. True wealth, as Stuart Chase says, would seem to lie in

> . . . security and leisure, coupled with a wide variety of useful and beautiful material things, and above all, an atmosphere in which the creative arts flourish, great projects are undertaken, temples rise, poets sing, and man climbs one step nearer to his remorseless destiny.

The Eastern attitude of leisure, compounded with security is perhaps the one sound basis that would lead to the reorganization of society, with a view to securing the real well-being of man.

The high premium put upon money as an incentive in Western society is being combatted by Russia in one way, and by India in another way. The money incentive is a false standard of measure. You seem to imagine that the more you pay a person, the more efficient he is apt to be. I do not believe for a moment that money wages and efficiency are very closely allied. Let me cite a personal illustration: Sometimes I am paid $200.00 for a lecture; sometimes I am paid $100.00; sometimes I go out and lecture for nothing. Do I deliver a better address when I am paid $200.00 than when I am paid less? I do not think so—at least I have not found the difference.

In Soviet Russia the system of paying each worker enough to sustain his physical self and to minister to his spiritual needs, is developing a new attitude toward the money incentive as conceived by the Western industrialized world. In his own way, Gandhi too believes in equalizing conditions for all, regardless of the functions performed.

In the light of this discussion, we can readily see how, in his struggle against the British empire, Gandhi is in a sense attempting to fight the very basis of modern economic organization with its inherent tendency toward imperialism. A free India would, therefore, mean a check upon the aggressive tendencies of Western industrialism and the distorted economic theories of the Western world.

A picture of the India of his dreams has been given by Gandhi in his own words, as follows:

> I shall strive for a constitution which shall release India from the thraldom and give her if need be the right to sin. I shall work for an India in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country; in whose making they have an effective voice; an India in which there shall be no high class or low class of people; an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony. There can be no room in such an India for the curse of intoxicating drinks and drugs. Women shall enjoy equal rights with men. Since we shall be at peace with all the rest of the world, neither exploiting nor being exploited, we should have the smallest army imaginable. All interests not in conflict with the interests of the dumb millions will be scrupulously respected whether foreign or indigenous. Personally, I hate distinction between foreigners and indigenous. This is the India of my dreams![2]

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.

[*Concluded*]

2. *Gandhi Versus the Empire*, pp. 325-6.

Are There Any Christians in Germany?

When a people is violently torn asunder by the nightmare of racial, religious or political persecution, it is not the persecuted minority but the persecuting majority which in the end will suffer most.

For the persecuted, though they endure physical torture and mental anguish, may yet save their souls. From the knowledge of their guiltlessness, their unmerited ordeal and their ultimate justification in the eyes of the world, they derive courage and strength; they develop an infinite capacity for endurance, and they cultivate fellowship, loyalty and selflessness. From the soil of persecution have the heroes and the saints of all ages sprung.

But the persecutors, in their blindness, are committing moral suicide. Reveling in an orgy of cruelty and injustice, gratified for the moment by the cheap victory of strength over weakness, they are sacrificing every spiritual value and are hurling themselves back into that darkness of savagery from which mankind has but slowly and painfully emerged.

It is this sorry spectacle of self-degradation which the Christendom of present-day Germany presents. After nineteen centuries of preaching of the tenets of Christianity, promulgated by that greatest of teachers and leaders who was born a Jew, the German Christians are indulging in the persecution of a racial minority of their own people, the like of which has not been witnessed since the days of the Inquisition. Everything that civilized mankind has come to regard as Christian ethics—to be just and kind, to protect the weak, to respect the aged, to be chivalrous to women and gentle with children—is being trodden underfoot by the Christians of Germany who have distorted even the symbol of Christianity. On the hooked cross, a savage emblem, they crucify Christ anew, not once but a thousand times each day.

To supplement their preaching and practicing of violence among adults, they undermine every Christian ideal of the next generation by poisoning the minds of the young. Not to love, but to hate one's neighbor, and to covet both his property and his job if he be non-Aryan, not to refrain from judging, conscious of one's own sins, but to take pride in throwing the first stone, not to seek "peace on earth, goodwill toward men," but to keep alive the flame of hatred against Germany's former enemies—these are the ethics being taught Christian children in German schools.

When the apostle of hatred, Adolf Hitler, came into power, and the brown shirts of the Nazis swept over Germany like a flood of muddy waters, we hoped and believed that only a fraction of German Christendom had sunk to this depth. We were inclined to pity the "decent Christians" who had been engulfed in the flood together with the Jews, and we firmly believed that in due time these decent Christians would be heard from. It did not seem possible that in the twentieth century, and in the land which had boasted of its culture, such medieval barbarity should go unchallenged by the Christian churches.

But, alas, the German churches have remained as silent as the tomb. During these six months of the Hitler horror we have not heard of a single Christian protest voiced in Germany against the persecution of the Jews. We have not learned that a single Protestant minister or Catholic priest has been imprisoned, or even deprived of his position, because he dared to defend his persecuted countrymen. The plea advanced by apologists for German Christendom, that individual protests would have been dangerous and futile besides, implies that we should condone and justify moral cowardice.

The early Christians did not question whether their resistance to the Roman Emperor was dangerous and futile. Neither did the apparent danger and futility of their objection deter conscientious objectors during the World War from remaining true to themselves and their ideals.

To remain silent in the presence of an injustice that cries to heaven, to refrain from opposing evil because it might involve danger to oneself and might not be productive of the desired result, is an easy and cowardly way of life that can but be regarded with contempt.

When once, during all this time, German Protestants dared to lift their voices in protest against the Hitler regime; it was because their own organization was threatened.

Christ did not die on the cross to save his own soul.

But silence has not remained the only sin of those who call themselves Christians in Germany. By means of their organizations and through their spokesmen German Christians, both Catholics and Protestants, are now coming forward to extol the present German government. A Catholic bishop exclaims, "our chancellor has been appointed by God," and a Protestant minister compares Adolf Hitler to Martin Luther. Body and soul German Christendom has delivered itself up to the most barbarous, benighted and cruel despotism of modern times, and thereby has betrayed the very essence of Christianity.

Pitiable is the plight of the German Jews, who are being impoverished, dishonored and driven from the land which they have loved and served, for which they have lived and died, and which has been their home for generations. But more pitiable still is the plight of the German Christians who have bartered away their souls.

META LILIENTHAL

Forest Prayer

Let me stand up symmetrical and free
Taking the storms and sunshine, like a tree
With roots embedded in the fertile past
And strength to breathe defiance to the last
Against outrageous slings of men and Fate! . .
Let me be murmurous as the forest is!—
Lifting brave arms to nesting birds and bees,
Till Death, the yokel Axeman, soon or late
Shall stretch me prone. . . So may the sawyers find
Me sound unto the core in heart and mind,
Who in mysterious cycles of the sun
Of all completed being here made one.

BRENT ALLINSON.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Revolt

I'm tired of names and gaudy flags and throngs,
Of herded crowds and trite and empty songs.
I'm tired of ducking heads and flexing knees,
Of cushioned pews and safe majorities.

The things my neighbors smirk and bow before
Seem mischievous and stupid to the core.
Where dull conformity in slumber nods
I never shall find God among the gods.

I must be free to pry, to dig, to thrust,
And chuck the vulgar creed into the dust,
Though I should lose in every battle fought,
And all my search should come to simple naught.

I will not pick and choose what I may see.
The path of stern uncertainty for me,
Though it should prove a way of toil and grief.
Lord, I believe. Confirm my unbelief!

HOMER C. HOUSE.

Machine—A Challenge

We condemn as soulless monster, a Frankenstein,
Iconoclastic fiend of base design,
That coils its tenacles around the vast
And sprawling continents beyond the last
Bewildered shore; annihilating space,
And hurling time from its accustomed place,
Then freighting the air with words to achieve its will,
Controlling the tides and mounting the winds with skill,
To hold within a powerful grasp as one,
All lands and peoples underneath the sun.

This force has indicated what is good,
This bold precursor of greater brotherhood.
Is man the equal of such enlightened strength?
Will spirit follow such undaunted length;
Fulfil the challenge, infinite, supreme,
(Which after all is but an ancient dream)
By sublimating race and national pride,
That universal life be glorified?

MARY WALLACE KIRK.

Chant at High Mass

I saw Him in a meadow by a stream.
I saw Him light the lintel of a home;
But O I never saw Him—
Never saw Him—
Walking in a proud procession
With the holy priests of Rome.

Cardinals with yellow faces,
Topped with stiff embroidered laces . . .
Robes of flowing purple . . .
Cross of gold!

I saw Him lift a perfumed cedar beam.
I saw Him break a lowly crust of bread;
But O I never saw Him—
Never saw Him—
Watching by a painted altar
With the relics of the dead.

Jeweled silks and ribboned towers . . .
Silver trumpets . . . silver flowers—
Life the season—*Death* the reason—
Splendid mould!

I saw Him in the market and the street.
I saw Him where the sick and humble dwell—
But O I never saw Him—
Never saw Him—
Kneeling with a pale ascetic
In the shadow of a cell.

Bleeding hands and tortured feet,
Flesh that cries for bread and meat . . .
He has fathered . . . He has gathered—
To His fold!

ROLAND COOKE.

New Moon

A sharp-edged golden scimitar
Is thrusting through invading clouds:
Let others magnify Excalibur,
I loathe a glory wrapped in shrouds!

HARRY ELMORE HURD.

The Study Table

Two Views of the Editor's New Book

I

Although Dr. John Haynes Holmes is usually thought of as a preacher of social reform, the ten sermons which comprise "The Sensible Man's View of Religion" speak more directly to the condition of the individual who is trying to live a reasonable religious life in the contemporary world. This is the tenth volume in Harper's "Monthly Pulpit," a series in which, each month, a famous American preacher is being presented.

There is a systematic quality to over half of these sermons, which, with the numbering of points in one, two, three fashion may lay naked the sermon structure, but it certainly does not leave us in doubt as to what Dr. Holmes thinks. As examples we lift the skeletons of three sermons almost verbatim from the book. "If Christians Were Christians" there are ten things, Dr. Holmes states, that would be desirably missing from the world. There would be no churches, no dogmas, no sects, no denominations, no anti-semitism, no race prejudice, no such thing as nationalism, no war, no poverty, no violence nor the machinery of violence such as prisons, armies, navies, and the police. "The Conquest of Fear" may be achieved, he shows in another sermon, through effort along six lines: through attaining and maintaining physical health, through personal modesty or humility, through the love of some other person, through self-giving devotion to some cause, through the practice of virtue, and through trust in the Over-Soul or Universal Spirit. When Dr. Holmes speaks on "Sex: Are There Any Standards?", he finds five standards and builds his sermon around them. (1) Sex relations shall be joined only on the basis of love. (2) They shall continue on the basis of love. (3) They shall be monogamous. (4) They shall be joined openly, not furtive, concealed, hidden. (5) They shall be joined and sustained by the social sanction. The sermons entitled "The Sensible Man's View of Religion," "The Dilemma of the Moral Life," and "The Good in Bad Times" might similarly be outlined.

Of course to abstract these sub-topics from the sermons does violence to the wealth of illustrative material which they contain. In several instances the structure is definitely subordinated to the material presented. In "Religion as an Opiate" the author discusses the way in which unworthy religions have put people to sleep intellectually, aided them to live in the world of phantasy, and sent them back painfully into a harsh world of reality, thus acting in much the same manner as other drugs act. But in this case the illustrative material used is far more revealing than the analysis around which the sermon is constructed. The

"The Sensible Man's View of Religion," by John Haynes Holmes. Introduction by Stephan S. Wise. New York, Harper and Brothers. 1933. 126 pp. $1.00.

now famous Armistice Day sermon "The Unknown Soldier Speaks" is quite different in temper and style from all the other sermons in the book. Imaginative, powerful, and artistic in form it is not only a classic among sermons but it deserves a permanent place in the greatest literature of the peace movement. Bearing in mind these exceptions, we may fairly say that the substance of Dr. Holmes' sermons may be carried home in an obvious outline which the preacher furnishes his listeners. Whatever the professor of homiletics may say about such enumeration, Dr. Holmes speaks with the authority of years of successful pulpit work. People evidently desire order, clarity, and careful analysis and Dr. Holmes succeeds usually in giving these things to them. He is justly chosen as one of America's greatest pulpit orators.

Critically considered these sermons are a valuable addition to the permanent records of a great liberal. He has moved far in a humanistic direction, yet still has his moorings fastened to transcendentalist shores. There are humanists who would question the notion of a moral universe to which he refers. They would also claim that Christians would have to be something more than Christians, to order humanity as Dr. Holmes would like to see it ordered. It would, according to these humanists take the intelligence of the scientist as well as the good-intentions of the Christian to produce such a world as he desires.

Dr. Holmes includes a sermon upon "Is the Universe Friendly?", a subject with which every liberal minister copes at some time. Here we have the author in a thoroughly humanistic mood. Neither a Cosmic Guarantor nor a cosmic guarantee of human values is indicated. He states simply that the world is not hostile, it is at its worst indifferent, but it is trustworthy and can be used by man for his own good. Our question should not be "What will the universe do to us?" but "What can we do to the universe?" This is the one sermon in the book in which we might have expected a clarification of Dr. Holmes' idea of God. But with all his clear and systematic treatment of other subjects, we are left to wonder about the vague Over-Soul or Universal Spirit to which he refers, and we still must find the God whom he has mentioned elsewhere, as equivalent to humanity, to be no God at all.

Another perplexity the reviewer encountered in reading the book arose from the sermon on "The Dilemma of the Moral Life." Here the difficulty seems to rest precisely in the schematic method by which Dr. Holmes approaches a subject, and which in other instances is so effective. The effort to know what is right is too complex a venture adequately to be served by four simple rules. We may for example "pay reverent heed to the wisdom of the ages." But that wisdom often proves to be a confused mass of contradictions or meaningless platitudes. We may draw some general rules like "love" but until these rules are given concrete application and interpretation they mean nothing and the interpretations and applications vary endlessly. Altogether admirable persons have lived splendid, satisfying lives in the service of widely varying ideals and values and with very different moral codes.

One is advised by Dr. Holmes to "live openly," to "do only what you are willing should be done in the sight of all men." But that implies that all men are fit judges of conduct. A predecessor of Dr. Holmes in his New York pulpit once declared, in effect, that whenever he found that the people in general believed a thing he took it to be, on the surface, evidence that the belief is wrong. May this not be true, in some instances, of matters ethical? The standards and attitudes of the public may be so unjust, so crassly materialistic, so spiritually inadequate that anyone who breaks with their irrational mores may promptly be crucified for his righteousness and to no avail. It is possible that what is right for an individual would be destroyed by the light of publicity. A certain amount of "hidism," may be ethically right and necessary. For example a young man may find it morally necessary to be a socialist. But if he told his boss at the plant of his political affiliations he would, let us assume, be promptly fired and his family made destitute. Should he live openly, or, as a "hidist," mind his own business? It is not a simple question. W. G. Sumner, in his "Folkways" showed that most everything has at some time or place been considered right by society. Some have taken that to mean that there is no such thing as right and wrong. But to the reviewer it means that society in general is a rather poor judge of right and wrong.

Dr. Holmes invokes as his third moral rule several forms of the Kantian imperative, "Do only what you are willing that all men should do as a universal rule of conduct." One may do what he is willing to have everyone else do *under similar circumstances* and yet because the individual's experience, and the social situation in which a person acts are usually unique, those particular circumstances may never be duplicated. If every act is relative to the individual performing it, and to the social situation within which it is performed, and these factors vary intimiately, then the categorical imperative is in many instances useless and moral decisions cannot be reduced to rule of thumb methods.

The fourth rule, the admonition to "eliminate yourself, and act only from disinterested motives" seems also to involve an essential contradiction. As human beings we are not biologically constructed completely to eliminate ourselves or to act only from disinterested motives. We are given by nature an instinctive equipment for self-preservation and we take naturally a vital interest in what we are doing, when we are doing what we *want* to do. We have a demand within for fulfilment and self-realization. The need for security, response, recognition and new experience, to use Thomas' "Four Wishes," is basic. Is it ethically necessary to fool ourselves about these drives? If other people's selves are worth serving, are not our own worth developing? The effort to be totally unselfish would either destroy a person or make a hypocrite of him. A self-conscious effort to be disinterested in motive would simply set up unnecessary stresses and defeat its own ends.

The reviewer accepts the truth that one's fulfilment is very often to be found in the service of others, or in interest-absorbing devotion to some cause. But the answer as to what is right is to be found, it seems, in the selection of values and ideals which are not anti-social, yet which prove personally satisfying. The problem seems to be that of "choosing one's values in terms of their total life context" as Dr. John Dewey has put it. Given right ideals and values, fulfilment is possible, at the least, without hindering the fulfilment of others; at the most by helping them to win their fulfilment. Thus on the basis of more life for your neighbor and for yourself, of live and help live, we find the right as that which leads to spontaneous, adventuresome, enthusiastic, joyous living.

We hope that in bringing out these shadings we have not made the author appear as an absolutist in ethics. He himself states that "there is no absolute or final answer to any question as to what is right." Yet we have the feeling that much of the fearlessness of Dr. Holmes' citizenship, the self-denying simplicity and devotion of his way of life, and the terrific power of his preaching have resulted from the application of such rules as these, which, if not thought of as absolutes, have served practically as such. There will be loss as well as gain as we become less certain about what is right. Certainly, more important than the form or content of these sermons is the man himself. Those who have had any contact with him whatsoever will find transfusing every word in this volume the personality of a man who lives conscientiously what he preaches so intensely.

EDWIN H. WILSON.

II

As already stated to Mr. Holmes, a book review is the reviewer's opportunity to prove how much smarter he is than the author. The merit of the present review will be to have stoutly resisted this temptation and remained studiously in the background.

The acid test of a good sermon is: Does it linger in the memory? Mr. Holmes's sermons pass this test. The very titles linger: "If Christians Were Christians," "Religion as an Opiate," "Is the Universe Friendly?" And so on for ten challenging topics, each inspiring at least a column of comment, where the reviewer must confine himself to one or two of these forays into the *terra incognita* of good sense. "But courage, brothers!" says Mr. Holmes. "It is a land flowing with milk and honey."

For example: "If Christians were Christians." Here a strayed Christendom is blandly introduced to its fundamentals and invited to consider whether carnivorous cacophony, in business, politics, and religion itself, is the legitimate fruit of our faith? Obviously not. *Revenons à nos moutons,* and we shall discover to our consternation that so long as we Christians pin our faith to millinery and militarism we are entitled to another guess. If Christians were Christians, there would be something doing in line with first principles.

Here we see Mr. Holmes as a radical fundamentalist; and while he makes no bid for the historicity of Jonah, he has the same fundamentalist instinct: to get down to the bed-rock of human experience, whether discovered by the prophets, or Plato, or the Stoics, or Modern Science, or the Cave Man. The result is: a reasonable degree of reassurance as to the basis of sensible religion.

In "Religion as an Opiate," Mr. Holmes deals with that popular brand of spiritual food whose right name is Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup, now running neck and neck in the race with Bock Beer. Yet the church which has condemned the latter has long since played the bar-keep to the deadlier dope! And why not? A religion that has no remedies must resort to anodynes. "Mitigations, always mitigations, never remedies!" says Emerson of the dope of his day. The hint is timely and may well be taken by a church, resenting the insult that "religion is the opiate of the people." If not, let it demand, or at least tolerate, something else besides "pillows and anodynes and a dolorous tune to beguile the distemper." (*R. W. E.*)

"Is the Universe Friendly?" Whether it is or not, Mr. Holmes is friendly to the universe—rather more so than his reviewer, who at this point yields to temptation and confesses that he is somewhat fed up on the universe as a mere sum in addition! One blooming thing after another, and a colossal bluffer at that, appealing to megalomania and flunkeyism! Like the Queen of Sheba, confronted by Solomon's pile, there is no strength in us at sight of this interminable bore!

Be that as it may, Mr. Holmes is not so hard on the universe as the present writer. The universe is friendly, says Mr. Holmes, in so far that it is not unfriendly or hostile, as primitive man imagined; and because it can be trusted to do the same old thing right along. Suggesting—what has doubtless occurred to Mr. Holmes—that if we add human thought to the natural process, we have some ground for concluding that "the universe cares." Here, in the thought process with its thirty legions of angels, whether poets, prophets, or scientists, is our compensation for the rough-housing of nature. (Or so we infer from this sermon!) Well and good. The universe may be dismissed with the verdict: "Not guilty; but don't do it again."

Time would fail us were we to descant adequately on Mr. Holmes's admirable treatise on up-to-date morals, wherein jazz morality, the community toothbrush, and other revamped Boccaccian ideals are higher criticised. "Consider," argues Mr. Holmes, "whether these resurgences of pre-bathroom ideology are strictly aesthetic or hygienic, let alone altruistic? The *reductio ad absurdum* is triumphant. Man has need of an art of life, even more than of finger bowls! The result is, we rise up with some respect for guiding stars, in lieu of the easiest way, as preached by Jack Falstaff."

> What's honor? A word. What is that word honor? A trim reckoning. Who hath it? He that died o' yesterday. Therefore I've none of it.

(N. B. This is by Shakespeare; but I am sure Mr. Holmes will write: "The above I fully endorse.")

Perhaps the most eloquent and moving of the whole ten is: "The Unknown Soldier Speaks." The Soldier, by night in Arlington Cemetery, tells Mr. Holmes how it feels to be a sacrifice to pagan gods and their high priests of politics and finance. The bloody rites of this religious hang-over are fitly cited with blistering satire and excoriating realism. The dumb, driven cattle of pseudo-patriotism are apprised of their latter end in the shambles of dedicated beef; while butchers of all nations and callings are stripped of their cant and unmasked as a rogue's gallery, with the soldier wielding a dog-whip to "lash the rascals naked through the world." (Shakespeare.)

Mr. Holmes always speaks deliverance to captives; and to those who are hencooped in some narrow tradition, whether theological, sociological, or pseudo-scientific, he brings release into a wider outlook. In fact, the whole book naturally raises the question: whether the crude, raw, unlovely thought-habits we have inherited in the name of religion, science, patriotism, business, or what not, are so very authoritative after all, when brought to the bar of good sense? On the contrary, how many of these hold-overs turn out to be the surviving monsters of our marsupial period? We too are their sometime affiliates; but now that we

have crawled out of the bog, it is time to take another look around. Mr. Holmes's look around is nothing if not emancipating—unless you are an exacerbated marsupial; in which event, he will encourage you to crawl on to higher ground.

But as all this is much better put in the sermons, we advise our ministers in particular to read, mark, and digest for pulpit use. A sensible minister will take his own wherever he finds it.

FRANKLIN KENT GIFFORD.

Correspondence

Repeal vs. the Recovery Plan

EDITOR OF UNITY:

If anything were needed to show the insidious nature of Wet propaganda it would be found in the course taken in the Repeal campaign. Everywhere the plea has been put forth that Repeal is an important link in the Recovery plan. Dry Democrats have been bludgeoned with the war cry that opposition to Repeal would mean treason to the President and the party in a time of crisis. And voters of all parties have been told that defeat of Repeal would spell repudiation of an administration engaged in a life and death struggle to save the country from economic chaos.

There is good reason for believing that numbers of Drys over the country have heeded these pleas and have held their convictions regarding liquor in abeyance in order to give the Recovery program their unqualified support. Yet no sooner has a state voted wet than the fact has been heralded through the Wet press as accumulating evidence of an overwhelming sentiment against prohibition. All that need be said is that the evidence is not all convincing when, along with the facts noted above, we consider the small total vote cast in the Repeal elections.

The prohibition law was betrayed in its early days by the appointment of divers ward heelers as enforcement officials in payment of political debts. And when corruption grew up, as naturally it would do under such officials, a subsidized press stood ready to denounce the law as impotent. I give Mr. Hoover credit for a more sincere effort than his predecessors revealed for proper enforcement. But much mischief had already been done by slack enforcement, and to this was added the influence of what was doubtless the most highly financed propaganda this country has known. Most powerful of all was the effect of the depression in causing discontent with existing policies.

So it is not strange that an adverse tide set in, nor that the Drys for the present have lost heart. We must abide our time and see what the Wets will do. If they achieve true temperance, as promised, none will be more gratified over the result than the present Drys. But I anticipate that a few years' experience under a Wet regime will cause a turning of the tide.

F. S. KINDER.

Denver, Colo.

Mischievous Sophistry About Battleships

To the Editor:

UNITY's comment on the foolishness of the argument that building more battleships is to be undertaken in order to "give more employment" was illustrated by a recent experience of mine when a business man adduced this as his own conviction. I informed him that the great High School in his town, occupied by 1,100 pupils, cost $665,000 and ought to last two or three hundred years, as I had seen many substantial buildings older than that. One of the new warships would cost twenty-five times as much as this superb building, and would go to the discard in twenty years. The number employed in building these twenty-five permanent structures would be vastly greater than those employed in building one warship. He listened soberly, and then said, "Yes, I see it now; I never thought of that before."

The navy men give a list of twenty-four industries that would be helped aside from the work of the actual builders. Let it be remembered that these schools would employ not only architects, carpenters, glaziers, plumbers, painters, bricklayers, masons, but lumbermen, quarrymen, makers of screws, of nails, of cement, railroad men, truckmen, makers of electrical apparatus, of roofing, furniture, curtains, porcelain bowls, plaster, paint. The difference in all this effort of production would be that one program would provide education for producers and the other would be to show foreign customers that we were prepared to kill them.

LUCIA AMES MEAD

Boston, Mass.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 34)

that Jews had been killed, injured or were being discriminated against.

Senator Robinson—For denouncing Hitlerite persecution of Jews on the floor of the United States Senate.

Dr. Cadman—For striving consistently for Christian-Jewish goodwill in America and arousing Christians here to Nazi brutality in Germany.

Mr. Holmes—For demanding that Christians formally disavow "the centuries-old libel that the Jews killed Christ."

The Rev. Everett Clinchy—For working for the elimination of anti-Jewish prejudice.—Boston *Herald.*

"Recovery"

Recovery, "what sins are committed in thy name!" First there was beer—to balance the budget. Next, repeal to avert higher taxes. And now half a billion of public money—to come out of the people sooner or later!—to build ships and planes and equip armies and navies that will be worse than useless. As soon as the public works appropriations were available, the army and navy cleared for action. . . . All this of course is for "national defence" and not a dollar is to be used otherwise. How can Federal Administrator Ickes make these allotments agree with the accepted principle, "Projects must entail no further recurring public expense for maintenance?" Battleships are indeed a costly toy. Mostly they rust out or are dismembered in the federal bone yards. As objects of "lasting social usefulness" they have had their day. Even their social usefulness is challenged, and the only "lasting" feature is likely to be the interest on the bonds which build them. That debt will be alive when the cruisers have gone to Davy Jones's locker, and the out-

moded destroyers have succumbed to the acetylene torch. When peace-loving people joined the agitation for government expenditure for unemployment relief, they thought of highways and bridges and forests and irrigation and power projects, to make this a better country to live in. They are against spending relief funds for making machines for killing people. They ought to tell the President so.—*Christian Advocate* (New York).

Anna Louise Strong in America October 22 to December 11, 1933.

It is now three years since Dr. Strong has been in America. During this time she has been busy organizing the American newspaper in Moscow, known as the "Moscow Daily News"; and bringing it from its early beginnings as a small weekly to its present condition as one of the leading English-language dailies outside the English-speaking lands. "Moscow Daily News" circulates to thousands of American workers and engineers in the Soviet Union and also to thousands of readers in America, England, Australia, Japan and the isles of the sea. Its organization being now on a firm base, its original initiator (now its Associate Editor) is free to return to her natural work, writing and lecturing.

During the past two years she has visited many collective farms and industries, making a special summer trip to the wilds of Oirotia, where she visited Kalinina, wife of President Kalinin, who is organizing a rest house, state farm and center of culture for the wild tribes of the Altai who are just beginning sedentary life. A lecture on these Altaian tribes will be of special interest to women's organizations. Dr. Strong also offers:

My Twelve Years in the Soviet Union.

Two Five-Year Plans — Their Methods, Cost and Achievements.

The Revolution in Farming—Its Present Stage.

Soviet Russia and the Peace of the World.

Wigwam Nomads of Siberia—The Altaian Oirots.

Dr. Strong's first engagement will be at Ford Hall, Boston, October 22. She will speak for the Community Church Forum in New York City on October 29. In the Chicago district she will be available from November 29 to December 6, from where she will go to the Coast. For further details address her in care of the Open Forum Speakers Bureau, 80 Boylston Street, Boston.

Position Wanted

A reader of UNITY, middle-aged, would like position as companion or housekeeper, Nov. 1st. Address Miss H., Box 552, Charlottesville, Va.

NIGHT SHALL PASS

By Henry E. Swensen

Vital Poems of Social Vision

Foreword by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney

"An enduring contribution," by Etta Josephine Murfey in Unity.
"His poems reveal vision and power."—Thos. C. Clark of Christian Century.

Enlarged Attractive Paper Cover Edition, 50 cents

Poetry Publishers, 529 Callowhill St., Philadelphia, Pa.

New and Revised Edition

INDIA IN BONDAGE

by JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Brought Strictly Up-to-Date—8 New Chapters on

The Momentous Events of the Last Two Years in England and India—India's Future—Will Gandhi Win?—Will There be a Bloody Revolution?—Is the New Constitution which Britain is Forging for India, a CHARTER OF FREEDOM, or a STEEL FRAME OR STRONGER BONDAGE?

$2.00 at All Bookstores or Direct from

LEWIS COPELAND COMPANY, 570 Lexington Ave., New York

Don't Fail to Read These Booklets!
Just Off the Press

Let's Be Square: Checkmating Russian Ballyhoo
(An exposé of some recent articles published about Russia)

Bugaboos: Facts About Popular Superstitions
(Looking into the origins of popular superstitions)

5 Cents Each (Postage 1c extra per copy)

Written and Published by

Russell Wright, Forest Avenue, Hammond, Indiana

For September-October

The New Humanist

HARRY ELMER BARNES

asks

Has History Value to Humanism?

Also

IRVING BABBITT AND HIS FUNDAMENTAL THINKING
by Alexander P. Cappon

CAN ROOSEVELT SOCIALIZE AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY?
Roland R. Renne

The Philosophy of the Sciences
Maynard Shipley

What the Manifesto Lacks
George R. Dodson

Scientific Method in Haydon's Religion
Gabriel Rombotis

When Physicists Philosophize
Arthur E. Murphy

THE NEW HUMANIST One dollar a year
Bi-monthly
Foreign $1.25
105 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago

"There is valuable material in this journal which I do not find elsewhere."
John Dewey.